work to complete the on-load and ready for sea processes. Learn your new ship well . . . trace every piping run, exercise every new piece of equipment, note every detail of each new space. Soon you will again feel the salt spray, the excitement of the hunt, and the thrill of the rescue. That close bond between ship and sailor will serve you well as CGC Resolute assumes her position in the forefront of Coast Guard operations.

Capt. Hested, on behalf of the Commandant, I accept Resolute back into the fleet. At the same time I present Decisive—''the queen of the fleet'' for her major maintenance availability.

I pass operational control of Resolute to Commander Atlantic Area and administrative control to Commander Maintenance and Logistics Command, Atlantic.

CDR Bernard, I charge you and your crew to be ''Semper Paratus'' in carrying out your missions. Do this in the same manner in which you, your crew, and Decisive's crews have done in the past. In closing, to the Decisive I say ''good job, we'll see you soon plying the Atlantic waters.'' To the Resolute, welcome back, welcome to the LANT area.

And we wish you the very best in your endeavors.

CDR Bernard, execute your orders.

ENGLISH AS THE OFFICIAL LANGUAGE

HON. THOMAS M. BARRETT

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 1996

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an article by John Gurda, an excellent author and historian in Milwaukee. The article appeared in the Milwaukee Journal Sentinel earlier this year. This article takes an intriguing look at the issue of English as the official language of the United States. It reminds us that most of us have ancestry which stems from outside the United States. It is with this in mind that I provide the following article.

[From the Milwaukee Journal Sentinel, Apr. 1, 1996]

HOW SOON THE ''ENGLISH FIRST'' CROWD FORGETS

(By John Gurda)

Their names are Seratti, Skindrud, Zukowski, Ziegelbauer, Gunderson, Goetsch, Buettner, Huebsch and Drzewiecki. They represent some of Wisconsin's leading ethnic groups—German, Norwegian, Polish and Italian—and it is a safe bet that none of their ancestors spoke a word of English when they arrived.

The irony is that the names belong to state legislators who are sponsoring the ''English First'' bill. Their measure would establish English as the ''official language of Wisconsin'' and would, with a few carefully worded exceptions, prohibit the use of other languages in ''all written expression'' by any unit of state or local government.

It seems puzzling, at first, that the bill would get a serious hearing in a state as ethnic as Wisconsin. It seems even stranger that elected officials would deny some current residents a privilege that their own ancestors enjoyed: the right to be addressed in their native tongues.

Linguistic diversity, officially endorsed, is older than the state. When Solomon Juneau became Milwaukee's first mayor in 1846, 1,000 copies of his inaugural address were printed—500 in English and 500 in German. The same policy was observed when Wisconsin adopted a constitution two years later. In the 1850s and '60s, the state published guidebooks in German, Norwegian, French, Dutch and Swedish, as well as in English, hoping to attract newcomers from Europe.

Immigrants responded by the thousands, making Wisconsin one of the most ''foreign'' states in the union and dotting the countryside with such settlements as New Glarus, New Holstein, Denmark, Belgium, Poland and Scandinavia. Ethnicity is still one of our hallmarks—a focus of festivals, an anchor of identity and, not least of all, a draw for tourists.

But diversity has always had a dark side as well. Wisconsin has suffered periodic outbreaks of nativism throughout its history; like some modern suburbanites, established residents of every period have tried to pull up the gangplank as soon as they were safely on the boat.

In the 1840s, for instance, when Irish and German immigrants demanded an equal voice in deliberations over statehood, the Milwaukee Sentinel was horrified: ''This is going too far. . . . One half of our population consists of foreigners and if this continues they will gain the upper hand and destroy our freedom. This thing is going too far.''

Wisconsin's immigrants returned the fire when their rights were threatened. In 1890, a Republican Legislature passed the Bennett Law, making instruction in English compulsory. Supporters of parochial schools were incensed. German, Scandinavian, Irish and Polish voters joined forces at the polls, making George Peck governor; he was the only Democrat to hold the pot between 1876 and 1932.

Intolerance reached a peak of sorts during and just after World War I. Germans were, to put it bluntly, persecuted. Bach, Brahms, and Beethoven were banned from the concert stage. Sauerkraut was rechristened ''liberty cabbage.'' In 1919, the Milwaukee Journal won a Pulitzer Prize for its efforts to root out local Germans who sided with Kaiser Wilhelm.

Soon after the war, nativists broadened their fire to include Poles, Italians, Greeks, Serbs and other ''new'' immigrants, a group that one bigot dismissed as ''historically downtrodden, atavistic and stagnant.'' Most politicians agreed. In the 1920s, Congress virtually halted the flow of immigration from southern and eastern Europe. The ''golden door'' lighted by the Statue of Liberty was slammed shut.

Seventy years later, immigrants are once again suspect. The English First campaign of 1996 is only the latest in a long series of attempts to legislate conformity, attempts to legislate conformity, attempts that seem to crest during times of uncertainty. Patriots of every generation have tried, in historian Gerd Korman's choice phrase, ''to replace the melting pot with a pressure cooker.''

The campaign has been blasted as small-minded, shortsighted and racist by Hispanics, Asians and other language minorities. The English First movement may be all of those things, but it is most of all unnecessary. Anyone who has spent time in the newer ethnic communities will tell you that the pressures to conform are enormous. Through the media, through the schools, through their own children, immigrant families soon learn what America expects of them. If they want a place at the table, if they want even a taste of the American dream, English is mandatory.

Why, then, the current outbreak of nativism? When you cut through all the rhetoric about ''uniting'' our society, what you sense is fear—fear that America is coming apart at the seams. The country seems to be filling in with strangers who show no eagerness to join the mainstream. That perception gives rise to a great unspoken question: Why can't they be like us?

It is one of the oldest questions in America. Yankees asked it of the Germans and the Irish, the Germans and Irish asked it of the Poles and Italians, and everyone asks it of Hispanics and Asians. The fact that so many groups once considered ''they'' have joined the ranks of ''us'' is, I would suggest, an obvious sign of America's power to absorb differences. But there are always newcomers to question.

And what should they answer? They should, in my opinion, respond that they are challenging the rest of us to live up to an ideal as old as the Republic: a belief that the many can become one without rejecting their ancestors, that unity and diversity can coexist in a creative and energizing tension.

There is only one noun in this country, and that is American. But there are dozens of adjectives: African, Belgian, Croatian, Danish, English, Filipino, German and on down the alphabet. It is our differences, mediated by our essential unity, that give this country its human appeal and its human power.

Those who would stifle diversity are denying themselves an important gift. Those who would insist on ''English First'' are betraying their own ignorance and their own pettiness, but they display something even more disturbing: a lack of faith in America.

RECOGNIZING THE WORK OF OUR NATION'S ANIMAL SHELTERS

HON. DOUG BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1996

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, our Nation's animal shelters and the tens of thousands of dedicated individuals who are employed by or volunteer in these facilities certainly deserve recognition for the work they have done in assisting animals. This Member is pleased that the Humane Society of the United States (HSUS), which has provided training and support to local animal shelters and humane organizations for over 40 years, has declared November 3–9, 1996, as National Animal Shelter Appreciation Week.

The idea for a national day of recognition and appreciation for animal shelters actually started with a humane society in this Member's district, the Capital Humane Society in Lincoln, NE. Bob Downey, the executive director of the Capital Humane Society, contacted the HSUS and suggested that they work together to establish a week intended to recognize the positive roles that animal shelters play in their communities; to recognize the staff and volunteers of shelters; and to educate the general public about animal shelters and the work they do.

The services offered by animal shelters are as varied as the communities they serve. Some handle animal control issues, such as controlling dogs running at large or sheltering unwanted or abandoned animals. Some conduct rescue operations by responding to calls regarding injured animals or animals that have fallen through the ice of a frozen lake or pond. Still others assist families who are considering adding a new four-legged member to the family by providing adoption services.